arXiv:1406.6132v2 [math.AG] 29 Jul 2014

VERSIONS OF INJECTIVITY AND EXTENSION THEOREMS

YOSHINORI GONGYO AND SHIN-ICHI MATSUMURA

Abstract. We give an analytic version of the injectivity theorem by using multiplier ideal sheaves, and prove some extension theorems for the adjoint bundle of dlt pairs. Moreover, by combining techniques of the minimal model program, we obtain some results for semi-ampleness related to the abundance conjecture in birational geometry and the Strominger-Yau-Zaslow conjecture for hyperKähler manifolds.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, we work over $\mathbb{C}$, the complex number field, and freely use the standard notation in [BCHM], [Dem], [KaMM], and [KoM]. Further we interchangeably use the words "Cartier divisors", "line bundles", and "invertible sheaves".

The following conjecture is one of the most important conjectures in the classification theory of algebraic varieties:

Conjecture 1.1 (Generalized abundance conjecture)**.** *Let X be a normal projective variety and Δ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor such that (X, Δ) is a klt pair. Then $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) = \kappa_\sigma(X, K_X + \Delta)$. In particular, if $K_X + \Delta$ is nef, then it is semi-ample.* (*For the definition of $\kappa(\cdot)$ and $\kappa_\sigma(\cdot)$, see* [N].)

Toward the abundance conjecture, we need to solve the non-vanishing conjecture and the extension conjecture, see [DHP], [F1, Introduction], [FG, Section5]. One of the purposes of this paper is to study the following extension conjecture for the adjoint bundle of dlt pairs formulated in [DHP, Conjecture 1.3]:

Conjecture 1.2 (Extension conjecture for dlt pairs)**.** *Let X be a normal projective variety and $S + B$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor with the following assumptions:*

- *$(X, S + B)$ is a dlt pair.*
- *$\lfloor S + B \rfloor = S$.*
- *$K_X + S + B$ is nef.*
- *$K_X + S + B$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly equivalent to an effective divisor D with $S \subseteq \mathrm{Supp} D \subseteq \mathrm{Supp}\,(S + B)$.*

Then the restriction map

$$H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + S + B))) \to H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + S + B)))$$

is surjective for all sufficiently divisible integers $m \geq 2$.

Date: July 30, 2014, version 1.06.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14E30, 14F18, 32L10, 32L20.

Key words and phrases. injectivity theorem, extension theorem, abundance conjecture.

When S is a normal irreducible variety (namely (X, S+B) is a plt pair), Demailly–Hacon–Păun proved the above conjecture in [DHP] by using technical methods based on a version of the Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem. This result can be seen as an extension theorem for plt pairs.

In this paper, we study the extension conjecture for *dlt pairs* by giving an analytic version of the injectivity theorem instead of the Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem. Thanks to the injectivity theorem, we can obtain some extension theorems for not only plt paris but also dlt pairs. This is one of our advantages. Our injectivity theorem is as follows:

Theorem 1.3 (A version of the injectivity theorem =Theorem 3.1)**.** *Let* (F, h_F) *and* (L, h_L) *be* (*singular*) *hermitian line bundles with semi-positive curvature on a compact Kähler manifold* X*. Assume that there exists an effective* $\mathbb{R}$*-divisor* Δ *with*

$$h_F = h_L^a \cdot h_\Delta,$$

where a *is a positive real number and* h_Δ *is the singular metric defined by* Δ*.*

Then for a (*non-zero*) *section* s *of* L *satisfying* $\sup_X |s|_{h_L} < \infty$*, the multiplication map*

$$\Phi_s : H^q(X, K_X \otimes F \otimes \mathcal{I}(h_F)) \xrightarrow{\otimes s} H^q(X, K_X \otimes F \otimes L \otimes \mathcal{I}(h_F h_L))$$

is (*well-defined and*) *injective for any* q*. Here* $\mathcal{I}(h)$ *denotes the multiplier ideal sheaf associated to a singular metric* h*.*

The injectivity theorem has been studied by several authors, for example, Tankeev [T], Kollár [Ko1], Enoki [E], Ohsawa [O], Enault–Viehweg [EV-book], Fujino [F2], [F5], [F4], [F-book], and Ambro [A1], [A2]. Recently the second author gave an injectivity theorem with multiplier ideal sheaves, which corresponds to the case of $\Delta = 0$ (see [Mat2]). Our proof is a generalization of the methods of [E], [O], [F5], and [Mat2].

By applying this injectivity theorem to an extension problem, we obtain the following extension theorem. Even if $K_X + \Delta$ is semi-positive (namely admits a smooth metric with semi-positive curvature), it seems to be not able to prove Conjecture 1.2 for dlt pairs by the Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem in at least current situation, and thus we need our injectivity theorem (Theorem 1.3).

Theorem 1.4 (=Theorem 4.1)**.** *Let* X *be a compact Kähler manifold and* $S + B$ *be an effective* $\mathbb{Q}$*-divisor with the following assumptions:*

- $S + B$ *is a simple normal crossing divisor with* $0 \leq S + B \leq 1$ *and* $\lfloor S + B \rfloor = S$*.*
- $K_X + S + B$ *is* $\mathbb{Q}$*-linearly equivalent to an effective divisor* D *with* $S \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} D$*.*
- $K_X + S + B$ *admits a* (*singular*) *metric* h *with semi-positive curvature.*

Then for an integer $m \geq 2$ *with Cartier divisor* $m(K_X+S+B)$ *and any section* $u \in H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X+S+B)))$ *that comes from* $H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + S + B)) \otimes \mathcal{I}(h^{m-1}h_B))$*, the section* u *can be extended to a section in* $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + S + B)))$*.*

In particular, we can prove Conjecture 1.2 under the assumption that $K_X + \Delta$ admits a (singular) metric whose curvature is semi-positive and Lelong number is identically zero (see Corollary 4.5). This assumption is stronger than the assumption that $K_X + \Delta$

is nef, but weaker than the assumption that $K_X + \Delta$ is semi-positive. Remark that Verbitsky proved the non-vanishing conjecture on hyperKähler manifolds under the same assumption (see [V]).

As compared with Conjecture 1.2, one of our advantages is removing the condition $\mathrm{Supp}\, D \subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(S + B)$ (this version of the extension conjecture is [FG, Conjecture 5.8]). Thanks to removing the condition $\mathrm{Supp}\, D \subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(S + B)$ in Conjecture 1.2, we can run the MMP preserving the good condition for metrics (cf. [DHP, Section 8] and [FG, Theorem 5.9]). By applying the above theorem and techniques of the MMP, we obtain the following theorem related to the abundance conjecture:

Theorem 1.5 (=Theorem 5.1)**.** *Assume that Conjecture 1.1 holds in dimension $n-1$. Let X be an n-dimensional normal projective variety and Δ be an $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor with the following assumptions:*

- *(X, Δ) is a klt pair.*
- *There exists a projective birational morphism $\varphi : Y \to X$ such that Y is smooth and $\varphi^*(\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + \Delta)))$ admits a (singular) metric whose curvature is semi-positive and Lelong number is identically zero. Here m is a positive integer such that $m(K_X + \Delta)$ is Cartier.*

If $\kappa(K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$, then $K_X + \Delta$ is semi-ample.

Finally, by combining Verbitsky's non-vanishing theorem ([V, Theorem 4.1]) on hyperKähler manifolds (holomorphic symplectic manifolds), we obtain a result for semi-ampleness on four dimensional projective hyperKähler manifolds, which is closely related to the Strominger-Yau-Zaslow conjecture for hyperKähler manifolds. See [AC] for recent related topics and [COP] for non-algebraic cases.

Theorem 1.6 (=Corollary 5.5)**.** *Let X be a 4-dimensional projective hyperKähler manifold and L be a line bundle admitting a (singular) metric whose curvature is semi-positive and Lelong number is identically zero. Then L is semi-ample.*

We summarize the contents of this paper. In Section 2, we collect the basic definitions and facts needed later. In Section 3, we prove the injectivity theorem (Theorem 1.3). In Section 4, we give direct applications of the injectivity theorem to the extension theorem (Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 4.5). Section 5 is devoted to results for semi-ampleness related to the abundance conjecture (Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.6).

Acknowledgments. The authors wish to express their deep gratitude to Professor Osamu Fujino for pointing out several mistakes in the draft and discussions, and to Professor Mihai Păun for a discussion about Theorem 4.1. The first author thanks Professors Paolo Cascini, Christopher Hacon, Keiji Oguiso, Vladimir Lazić for discussions and comments. The first author is partially supported by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (A) ♯26707002 from JSPS and the Research expense from the JRF fund. The second author is partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) ♯25800051 from JSPS.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we first recall the definitions and basic properties of singular metrics and multiplier ideal sheaves. For more details, refer to [Dem], [Dem-book].

We denote by X a compact complex manifold and by F a line bundle on X unless otherwise mentioned. Further we fix a smooth (hermitian) metric g on F.

Definition 2.1 (Singular metrics and their curvature currents)**.**

(1) For an L^1-function φ on X, the metric h defined by

$$h := ge^{-\varphi}$$

is called a *singular metric* on F. Further φ is called the *weight* of h with respect to the fixed smooth metric g.

(2) A (singular) metric h on F is said to have *algebraic* (resp. *analytic*) *singularities*, if there exists an ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$ such that a weight φ of h can be locally written as

$$\varphi = \frac{c}{2}\log\left(|f_1|^2 + |f_2|^2 + \cdots + |f_k|^2\right) + v,$$

where c is a positive rational number (resp. real number), $f_1, \dots f_k$ are local generators of $\mathcal{I}$, and v is a smooth function.

(3) The *curvature current* $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_h(F)$ associated to h is defined by

$$\sqrt{-1}\Theta_h(F) = \sqrt{-1}\Theta_g(F) + dd^c\varphi,$$

where $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_g(F)$ is the Chern curvature of g.

In this paper, we simply abbreviate the singular metric (resp. the curvature current) to the metric (resp. the curvature). The Levi form $dd^c\varphi$ is taken in the sense of distributions, and thus the curvature is a $(1,1)$-current but not always a smooth $(1,1)$-form. The curvature $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_h(F)$ of h is said to be *semi-positive* if $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_h(F) \geq 0$ in the sense of currents.

Definition 2.2 (Multiplier ideal sheaves)**.** Let h be a metric on F such that $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_h(F) \geq \gamma$ for some smooth $(1,1)$-form γ on X. The ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}(h)$ defined to be

$$\mathcal{I}(h)(B) := \mathcal{I}(\varphi)(B) := \{f \in \mathcal{O}_X(B) \,\big|\, |f|\, e^{-\varphi} \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(B)\}$$

for every open set $B \subseteq X$, is called the *multiplier ideal sheaf* associated to h.

It is known that multiplier ideal sheaves are coherent sheaves. The following is a typical example of singular metrics that often appear in algebraic geometry.

Example 2.3. For given holomorphic sections $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^N$ of the m-th tensor powers F^m of F, the (singular) metric $ge^{-\varphi}$ can be defined by

$$\varphi := \frac{1}{2m}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\log|s_i|^2_{g^m}.$$

Then the curvature of this metric is semi-positive, and further the multiplier ideal sheaf can be algebraically computed (see [Dem]). In particular, for an effective $\mathbb{R}$-divisor D on X, the metric h_D on $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ can be constructed by the natural section of D. We can easily check $\mathcal{I}(h_D) = \mathcal{O}_X(-\lfloor D \rfloor)$ if D is a simple normal crossing divisor.

We recall the definition of the Lelong number of singular metrics and Skoda's lemma which gives a relation between the multiplier ideal sheaf and the Lelong number of singular metrics.

Definition 2.4 (Lelong numbers)**.** Let φ be a (quasi-)psh function on an open set B in $\mathbb{C}^n$. The *Lelong number* $\nu(\varphi, x)$ of φ at $x \in B$ is defined by

$$\nu(\varphi, x) = \liminf_{z \to x} \frac{\varphi(z)}{\log|z - x|}.$$

For a singular metric h on F such that $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_h(F) \geq \gamma$ for some smooth $(1,1)$-form, we define the Lelong number $\nu(h, x)$ of h at $x \in X$ by $\nu(h, x) := \nu(\varphi, x)$, where φ is a weight of h.

Theorem 2.5 (Skoda's lemma)**.** *Let φ be a (quasi)-psh function on an open set B in $\mathbb{C}^n$.*

- *If $\nu(\varphi, x) < 1$, then we have $\mathcal{I}(\varphi)_x = \mathcal{O}_{B,x}$.*
- *If $\nu(\varphi, x) \geq n + s$ for some integer $s \geq 0$, then we have $\mathcal{I}(\varphi)_x \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{B,x}^{s+1}$, where $\mathfrak{M}_{B,x}$ is the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{B,x}$.*

Next we give the definition of singularities of pairs.

Definition 2.6 (Singularities of pairs)**.** Let X be a normal variety and Δ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. Let $\varphi : Y \to X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ). We set

$$K_Y = \varphi^*(K_X + \Delta) + \sum a_i E_i,$$

where E_i is a prime divisor on Y for every i. The pair (X, Δ) is called

- *kawamata log terminal* (*klt*, for short) if $a_i > -1$ for all i,
- *log canonical* (*lc*, for short) if $a_i \geq -1$ for all i.

Definition 2.7 (Semi-log canonical, [F1, Definition 1.1])**.** Let X be a reduced S_2-scheme. We assume that it is pure n-dimensional and is normal crossing in codimension 1. Let Δ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Weil divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier.

Let $X = \bigcup X_i$ be the decomposition into irreducible components, and $\nu : X' := \coprod X_i' \to X = \bigcup X_i$ the *normalization*, where the *normalization* $\nu : X' = \coprod X_i' \to X = \bigcup X_i$ means that $\nu|_{X_i'} : X_i' \to X_i$ is the usual normalization for any i. We call X a *normal scheme* if ν is isomorphic. Define the $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Θ on X' by $K_{X'} + \Theta = \nu^*(K_X + \Delta)$ and set $\Theta_i = \Theta|_{X_i'}$.

We say that (X, Δ) is *semi-log canonical* (for short, *slc*) if (X_i', Θ_i) is an lc pair for every i.

3. A Version of the Injectivity theorem

The purpose of this section is to give an analytic version of the injectivity theorem by using multiplier ideal sheaves. This theorem is a generalization of [Mat2, Theorem 1.3] and it is applied in order to obtain the extension theorem (Theorem 1.4). See [F5] and [Mat2] for relations of various injectivity theorems and vanishing theorems.

Theorem 3.1 (A version of the injectivity theorem)**.** *Let* (F, h_F) *and* (L, h_L) *be* (*singular*) *hermitian line bundles with semi-positive curvature on a compact Kähler manifold* X*. Assume that there exists an effective* $\mathbb{R}$*-divisor* Δ *with*

$$h_F = h_L^a \cdot h_\Delta,$$

where a *is a positive real number and* h_Δ *is the singular metric defined by* Δ*.*

Then for a (*non-zero*) *section* s *of* L *satisfying* $\sup_X |s|_{h_L} < \infty$*, the multiplication map*

$$\Phi_s : H^q(X, K_X \otimes F \otimes \mathcal{I}(h_F)) \xrightarrow{\otimes s} H^q(X, K_X \otimes F \otimes L \otimes \mathcal{I}(h_F h_L))$$

is (*well-defined and*) *injective for any* q*. Here* $\mathcal{I}(h)$ *denotes the multiplier ideal sheaf associated to a singular metric* h*.*

Remark 3.2. (1) *The multiplication map is well-defined thanks to the assumption of* $\sup_X |s|_{h_L} < \infty$*. When* h_L *is a metric with minimal singularities on* L*, this assumption is always satisfied for any section* s *of* L (*see* [Dem] *for the definition of metrics with minimal singularities*).

(2) The case of $\Delta = 0$ *corresponds to the main result in* [Mat2]*. To obtain the extension theorem* (*Theorem 1.4*)*, it is important to consider the case of* $\Delta \neq 0$*.*

(3) *If* h_L *and* h_F *are smooth on a Zariski open set, the same conclusion holds under the weaker assumption of* $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_F}(F) \geq a\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_L}(L)$ (*see* [F5], [Mat1]).

Proof. The proof is a generalization of the proof of the main result in [Mat2] which corresponds to the case of $\Delta = 0$. First of all, we recall Enoki's techniques to generalize Kollar's injectivity theorem, which give a proof of the special case where h_L is smooth and $\Delta = 0$. In this case, the cohomology group $H^q(X, K_X \otimes F)$ is isomorphic to the space of the harmonic forms with respect to h_F

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F)_{h_F} := \{u \mid u \text{ is a smooth } F\text{-valued } (n,q)\text{-form on } X \text{ such that } \overline{\partial}u = D''^*_{h_F}u = 0.\},$$

where $D''^*_{h_F}$ is the adjoint operator of the $\overline{\partial}$-operator. For an arbitrary harmonic form $u \in \mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F)_{h_F}$, we can conclude that $D''^*_{h_F h_L} su = 0$ thanks to semi-positivity of the curvature and $h_F = h_L^a$. This step strongly depends on semi-positivity of the curvature. Then the multiplication map Φ_s induces the map from $\mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F)_{h_F}$ to $\mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F \otimes L)_{h_F h_L}$, and thus the injectivity is obvious.

In our situation, we must consider singular metrics with transcendental (non-algebraic) singularities. It is quite difficult to directly handle transcendental singularities, and thus in Step 1, we approximate a given metric h_F by metrics $\{h_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ that are smooth on a Zariski open set. Then we represent a given cohomology class in $H^q(X, K_X \otimes F \otimes \mathcal{I}(h_F))$ by the associated harmonic form u_ε with respect to h_ε on the Zariski open set. We want to show

that su_ε is also harmonic by using the same method as Enoki's proof. However, the same argument as Enoki's proof fails since the curvature of h_ε is not semi-positive. For this reason, in Step2, we investigate the asymptotic behavior of the harmonic forms u_ε with respect to a family of the regularized metrics $\{h_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$. Then we show that the L^2-norm $\|D''^{*}_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|$ converges to zero as letting ε go to zero, where $h_{L,\varepsilon}$ is a suitable approximation of h_L. Moreover, In Step 3, we construct solutions γ_ε of the $\overline{\partial}$-equation $\overline{\partial}\gamma_\varepsilon = su_\varepsilon$ such that the L^2-norm $\|\gamma_\varepsilon\|$ is uniformly bounded, by applying the Čech complex with the topology induced by the local L^2-norms. In Step 4, we see

$$\|su_\varepsilon\|^2 = \langle\langle su_\varepsilon, \overline{\partial}\gamma_\varepsilon\rangle\rangle \leq \|D''^{*}_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|\|\gamma_\varepsilon\| \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

From these observations, we can conclude that u_ε converges to zero in a suitable sense, which completes the proof.

Step 1 (The equisingular approximation of h_F)

Throughout the proof, we fix a Kähler form ω on X. For the proof, we want to apply the theory of harmonic integrals, but the metric h_F may not be smooth. For this reason, we approximate h_F by metrics $\{h_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ that are smooth on a Zariski open set. By [DPS, Theorem 2.3], we can obtain metrics $\{h_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ on F with the following properties:

(a) h_ε is smooth on $X \setminus Z_\varepsilon$, where Z_ε is a subvariety on X.
(b) $h_{\varepsilon_2} \leq h_{\varepsilon_1} \leq h_F$ holds for any $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2$.
(c) $\mathcal{I}(h_F) = \mathcal{I}(h_\varepsilon)$.
(d) $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon}(F) \geq -\varepsilon\omega$.

Since the point-wise norm $|s|_{h_L}$ is bounded on X and $h_F = h_L^a h_\Delta$, the set $\{x \in X \mid \nu(h_F, x) > 0\}$ is contained in the subvariety Z defined by $Z := s^{-1}(0) \cup \operatorname{Supp}\Delta$. Therefore we may assume a stronger property than property (a) (for example see [Mat2, Theorem 2.3]), namely

(e) h_ε is smooth on $Y := X \setminus Z$, where $Z = s^{-1}(0) \cup \operatorname{Supp}\Delta$.

Now we construct a "complete" Kähler form on Y with suitable potential function. Take a quasi-psh function ψ on X such that ψ has a logarithmic pole along Z and ψ is smooth on Y. Since quasi-psh functions are upper semi-continuous, the function ψ is bounded above, and thus we may assume $\psi \leq -e$. Then we define the $(1,1)$-form $\widetilde{\omega}$ on Y by

$$\widetilde{\omega} := \ell\omega + dd^c\Psi,$$

where ℓ is a positive number and $\Psi := \frac{1}{\log(-\psi)}$. We can show that the $(1,1)$-form $\widetilde{\omega}$ satisfies the following properties for a sufficiently large $\ell > 0$:

(A) $\widetilde{\omega}$ is a complete Kähler form on Y.
(B) Ψ is bounded on X.
(C) $\widetilde{\omega} \geq \omega$.

Indeed, properties (B), (C) are obvious by the definition of Ψ and $\widetilde{\omega}$, and property (A) follows from straightforward computations (see [F5, Lemma 3.1] for the precise proof of property (A)).

In the proof, we mainly consider harmonic forms on Y with respect to h_ε and $\widetilde{\omega}$. Let $L^{n,q}_{(2)}(Y,F)_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}$ be the space of the L^2-integrable F-valued (n,q)-forms α with respect to the inner product $\|\cdot\|_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}$ defined by

$$\|\alpha\|^2_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} := \int_Y |\alpha|^2_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}\, \widetilde{\omega}^n.$$

Then we can obtain the following orthogonal decomposition:

$$L^{n,q}_{(2)}(Y,F)_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} = \operatorname{Im}\overline{\partial} \oplus \mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F)_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} \oplus \operatorname{Im} D''^{*}_{h_\varepsilon}.$$

Here the operator $D'^{*}_{h_\varepsilon}$ (resp. $D''^{*}_{h_\varepsilon}$) denotes the closed extension of the formal adjoint of the $(1,0)$-part D'_{h_ε} (resp. $(0,1)$-part $D''_{h_\varepsilon} = \overline{\partial}$) of the Chern connection $D_{h_\varepsilon} = D'_{h_\varepsilon} + D''_{h_\varepsilon}$. Note that they coincide with the Hilbert space adjoints since $\widetilde{\omega}$ is complete. Further $\mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F)_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}$ denotes the space of the harmonic forms with respect to h_ε and $\widetilde{\omega}$, namely

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F)_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} := \{\alpha \mid \alpha \text{ is an } F\text{-valued } (n,q)\text{-form with } \overline{\partial}\alpha = D''^{*}_{h_\varepsilon}\alpha = 0.\}.$$

Harmonic forms in $\mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F)_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}$ are smooth by the regularization theorem for elliptic operators. These results are known to specialists. The precise proof of them can be found in [F5, Claim 1].

For every (n,q)-form β, we have $|\beta|^2_{\widetilde{\omega}}\, \widetilde{\omega}^n \le |\beta|^2_{\omega}\, \omega^n$ since the inequality $\widetilde{\omega} \ge \omega$ holds by property (C). From this inequality and property (b) of h_ε, we obtain

$$\|\alpha\|_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} \le \|\alpha\|_{h_\varepsilon,\omega} \le \|\alpha\|_{h_F,\omega} \tag{1}$$

for an F-valued (n,q)-form α, which plays a crucial role in the proof.

Take an arbitrary cohomology class $\{u\} \in H^q(X, K_X \otimes F \otimes \mathcal{I}(h_F))$ represented by an F-valued (n,q)-form u with $\|u\|_{h_F,\omega} < \infty$. In order to prove that the multiplication map Φ_s is injective, we assume that the cohomology class of su is zero in $H^q(X, K_X \otimes F \otimes L \otimes \mathcal{I}(h_F h_L))$. Our final goal is to show that the cohomology class of u is actually zero under this assumption.

By inequality (1), we have $\|u\|_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} < \infty$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore by the above orthogonal decomposition, there exist $u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F)_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}$ and $v_\varepsilon \in L^{n,q-1}_{(2)}(Y,F)_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}$ such that

$$u = u_\varepsilon + \overline{\partial} v_\varepsilon.$$

Note that the component of $\operatorname{Im} D''^{*}_{h_\varepsilon}$ is zero since u is $\overline{\partial}$-closed.

At the end of this step, we explain the strategy of the proof. In Step 2, we show that $\|D''^{*}_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} s u_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}}$ converges to zero as letting ε go to zero. Here $h_{L,\varepsilon}$ is the singular metric on L defined by

$$h_{L,\varepsilon} := h^{1/a}_\varepsilon\, h^{-1/a}_\Delta.$$

Since the cohomology class of su is zero, there are solutions γ_ε of the $\overline{\partial}$-equation $\overline{\partial}\gamma_\varepsilon = s u_\varepsilon$. For the proof, we need to obtain L^2-estimates of them. In Step 3, we construct solutions

γ_ε of the $\overline{\partial}$-equation $\overline{\partial}\gamma_\varepsilon = su_\varepsilon$ such that the norm $\|\gamma_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}}$ is uniformly bounded. Then we have

$$\|su_\varepsilon\|^2_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}} \leq \|D''^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}} \|\gamma_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}}.$$

By Step 2 and Step 3, we can conclude that the right hand side goes to zero as letting ε go to zero. In Step 4, from this convergence, we prove that u_ε converges to zero in a suitable sense, which implies that the cohomology class of u is zero.

Step 2 (A generalization of Enoki's proof of the injectivity theorem)
The aim of this step is to prove the following proposition, whose proof can be seen as a generalization of Enoki's injectivity theorem.

Proposition 3.3. *As letting ε go to zero, the norm $\|D''^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}}$ converges to zero.*

Proof of Proposition 3.3. We have the following inequality:

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} \leq \|u\|_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} \leq \|u\|_{h,\omega}. \tag{2}$$

This inequality is often used in the proof. The first inequality follows from the definition of u_ε and the second inequality follows from inequality (1). Remark the right hand side does not depend on ε. By applying Nakano's identity and the density lemma to u_ε (for example see [Mat2, Proposition 2.4]), we obtain

$$0 = \langle\!\langle \sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon}(F)\Lambda_{\widetilde{\omega}} u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon \rangle\!\rangle_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} + \|D'^*_{h_\varepsilon} u_\varepsilon\|^2_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}. \tag{3}$$

Note that the left hand side is zero since u_ε is harmonic. Let A_ε be the first term and B_ε be the second term of the right hand side of equality (3). First, we show that the first term A_ε and the second term B_ε converge to zero. For simplicity, we denote the integrand of A_ε by g_ε, namely

$$g_\varepsilon := \langle \sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon}(F)\Lambda_{\widetilde{\omega}} u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon \rangle_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}.$$

Then there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ (independent of ε) such that

$$g_\varepsilon \geq -\varepsilon C|u_\varepsilon|^2_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}}. \tag{4}$$

It is easy to check this inequality. Indeed, let $\lambda^\varepsilon_1 \leq \lambda^\varepsilon_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda^\varepsilon_n$ be the eigenvalues of $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon}(F)$ with respect to $\widetilde{\omega}$. Then for any point $y \in Y$ there exists a local coordinate $(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n)$ centered at y such that

$$\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon}(F) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda^\varepsilon_j dz_j \wedge d\overline{z_j} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\omega} = \sum_{j=1}^n dz_j \wedge d\overline{z_j} \quad \text{at } y.$$

When we locally write u_ε as $u_\varepsilon = \sum_{|K|=q} f^\varepsilon_K\, dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n \wedge d\overline{z}_K$, we have

$$g_\varepsilon = \sum_{|K|=q} \Big(\sum_{j\in K} \lambda^\varepsilon_j \Big) |f^\varepsilon_K|^2_{h_\varepsilon}$$

by a straightforward computation. On the other hand, from property (C) of $\widetilde{\omega}$ and property (d) of h_ε, we have $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon}(F) \geq -\varepsilon\omega \geq -\varepsilon\widetilde{\omega}$. This implies $\lambda_j^\varepsilon \geq -\varepsilon$, and thus we obtain inequality (4).

From equality (3) and inequality (4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq A_\varepsilon &= \int_Y g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \\ &\geq -\varepsilon C \int_Y |u_\varepsilon|^2_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \\ &\geq -\varepsilon C \|u\|^2_{h_F,\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from inequality (2). Therefore A_ε converges to zero, and further we can conclude that B_ε also converges to zero by equality (3).

To apply Nakano's identity to su_ε again, we first check $su_\varepsilon \in L^{n,q}_{(2)}(Y, F\otimes L)_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}}$. By the assumption, the point-wise norm $|s|_{h_L}$ with respect to h_L is bounded, and further we have $|s|_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} \leq |s|_{h_L}$ from property (b) of h_ε. They imply

$$\|su_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}} \leq \sup_X |s|_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} \leq \sup_X |s|_{h_L} \|u\|_{h_F,\omega} < \infty.$$

Remark that the right hand side does not depend on ε. By applying Nakano's identity to su_ε, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D''^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|^2_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}} \\ &= \langle\!\langle \sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}}(F\otimes L)\Lambda_{\widetilde{\omega}} su_\varepsilon, su_\varepsilon \rangle\!\rangle_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}} + \|D'^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|^2_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Here we used $\overline{\partial} su_\varepsilon = 0$. We first see that the second term of the right hand side converges to zero. Since s is a holomorphic $(0,0)$-form, we have $D'^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon = sD'^*_{h_\varepsilon} u_\varepsilon$. Thus we have

$$\|D'^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|^2_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}} \leq \sup_X |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} \int_Y |D'^*_{h_\varepsilon} u_\varepsilon|^2_{h_\varepsilon,\widetilde{\omega}} \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \leq \sup_X |s|^2_{h_L} B_\varepsilon.$$

Since $|s|^2_{h_L}$ is bounded and B_ε converges to zero, the second term $\|D'^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}}$ also converges to zero.

For the proof of the proposition, it remains to show that the first term of the right hand side of equality (5) converges to zero. We can easily see $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}}(F\otimes L) = (1+1/a)\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon}(F)$ from $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\Delta} = 0$ on Y and the definition of $h_{L,\varepsilon}$. Therefore we obtain

$$\langle\!\langle \sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}}(F\otimes L)\Lambda_{\widetilde{\omega}} su_\varepsilon, su_\varepsilon \rangle\!\rangle_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon},\widetilde{\omega}} = (1+1/a)\int_Y |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n$$

Now we investigate A_ε in details. By the definition of A_ε, we have

$$A_\varepsilon = \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \geq 0\}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n + \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \leq 0\}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n.$$

It is easy to see that the second term converges to zero. Indeed, simple computations and inequality (4) imply

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \leq 0\}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n &\geq -\varepsilon C \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \leq 0\}} |u_\varepsilon|^2_{h_\varepsilon, \widetilde{\omega}} \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \\ &\geq -\varepsilon C \int_Y |u_\varepsilon|^2_{h_\varepsilon, \widetilde{\omega}} \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \\ &\geq -\varepsilon C \|u\|^2_{h_F, \omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the first term also converges to zero. Now we have

$$\int_Y |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n = \Big\{ \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \geq 0\}} |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n + \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \leq 0\}} |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \Big\}.$$

On the other hand, we have the inequalities

- $$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \geq 0\}} |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n &\leq \sup_X |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \geq 0\}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \\ &\leq \sup_X |s|^2_{h_L} \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \geq 0\}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n, \end{aligned}$$
- $$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \leq 0\}} |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n_\varepsilon &\geq \sup_X |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon}} \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \leq 0\}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \\ &\geq \sup_X |s|^2_{h_L} \int_{\{g_\varepsilon \leq 0\}} g_\varepsilon \, \widetilde{\omega}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the right hand side of equality (5) converges to zero. We obtain the conclusion of Proposition 3.3. □

Step 3 (A construction of solutions of the $\overline{\partial}$-equation via the Čeck complex)
By the absolutely same method as [Mat2, Step 3], we can prove the following proposition. See [Mat2, Step 3] for the proof.

Proposition 3.4. *There exist F-valued $(n, q-1)$-forms α_ε on Y with the following properties*:

(1) $\overline{\partial}\alpha_\varepsilon = u - u_\varepsilon$. (2) *The norm $\|\alpha_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon, \widetilde{\omega}}$ is uniformly bounded.*

Step 4 (The limit of the harmonic forms)
In this step, we investigate the limit of u_ε and complete the proof of Theorem 3.1. First we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.5. *There exist $F \otimes L$-valued $(n, q-1)$-forms γ_ε on Y with the following properties*:

(1) $\overline{\partial}\gamma_\varepsilon = s u_\varepsilon$. (2) *The norm $\|\gamma_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}}$ is uniformly bounded.*

Proof. There exists an $F \otimes L$-valued $(n, q-1)$-form γ such that $\overline{\partial}\gamma = su$ and $\|\gamma\|_{h_F h_L, \omega} < \infty$. (Recall that we are assuming that the cohomology class of su is zero in $H^q(X, K_X \otimes F \otimes L \otimes \mathcal{I}(h_F h_L))$.) If we take α_ε with the properties in Proposition 3.4 and put $\gamma_\varepsilon := -s\alpha_\varepsilon + \gamma$, then we have $\overline{\partial}\gamma_\varepsilon = su_\varepsilon$. Further an easy computation yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|\gamma_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}} &\leq \|s\alpha_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}} + \|\gamma\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}} \\ &\leq \sup_X |s|_{h_L} \|\alpha_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon, \widetilde{\omega}} + \|\gamma\|_{h_F h_L, \widetilde{\omega}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\gamma\|_{h_F h_L, \widetilde{\omega}} \leq \|\gamma\|_{h_F h_L, \omega} < \infty$ and the norm $\|\alpha_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon, \widetilde{\omega}}$ is uniformly bounded, the right hand side can be estimated by a constant independent of ε. □

We consider the limit of the norm $\|su_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}}$.

Proposition 3.6. *The norm $\|su_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}}$ converges to zero as letting ε go to zero.*

Proof. By taking $\gamma_\varepsilon \in L^{n,q-1}_{(2)}(Y, F \otimes L)_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}}$ satisfying the properties in Proposition 3.5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|su_\varepsilon\|^2_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}} &= \langle\!\langle su_\varepsilon, \overline{\partial}\gamma_\varepsilon \rangle\!\rangle_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}} \\ &= \langle\!\langle D''^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon, \gamma_\varepsilon \rangle\!\rangle_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}} \\ &\leq \|D''^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}} \|\gamma_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}}.\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.5, the norm $\|\gamma_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}}$ is uniformly bounded. On the other hand, the norm $\|D''^*_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}} su_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}}$ converges to zero by Proposition 3.3. Therefore the norm $\|su_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon, \widetilde{\omega}}$ also converges to zero. □

Fix a small number $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Then for any positive number ε with $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, by property (b) of h_ε, we obtain

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{h_{\varepsilon_0}, \widetilde{\omega}} \leq \|u_\varepsilon\|_{h_\varepsilon, \widetilde{\omega}} \leq \|u\|_{h_F, \omega}.$$

It says that the norm of u_ε with respect to h_{ε_0} is uniformly bounded. Therefore there exists a subsequence of $\{u_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ that converges to $\alpha \in L^{n,q}_{(2)}(Y, F)_{h_{\varepsilon_0}, \widetilde{\omega}}$ with respect to the weak L^2-topology. For simplicity, we denote this subsequence by the same notation $\{u_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$. Then we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.7. *The weak limit α of $\{u_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ in $L^{n,q}_{(2)}(Y, F)_{h_{\varepsilon_0}, \widetilde{\omega}}$ is zero.*

Proof. For every positive number $\delta > 0$, we define the open subset A_δ of Y by $A_\delta := \{x \in Y \mid |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon_0}} > \delta\}$. By an easy computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|su_\varepsilon\|^2_{h_\varepsilon h_{L,\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\omega}} &\geq \|su_\varepsilon\|^2_{h_{\varepsilon_0} h_{L,\varepsilon_0}, \widetilde{\omega}} \\ &\geq \int_{A_\delta} |s|^2_{h_{L,\varepsilon_0}} |u_\varepsilon|^2_{h_{\varepsilon_0}, \widetilde{\omega}} \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \\ &\geq \delta \int_{A_\delta} |u_\varepsilon|^2_{h_{\varepsilon_0}, \widetilde{\omega}} \, \widetilde{\omega}^n \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

for any $\delta > 0$. Since the left hand side converges to zero, the norm $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{h_{\varepsilon_0},\widetilde{\omega},A_\delta}$ on A_δ also converges to zero. Notice that $u_\varepsilon|_{A_\delta}$ converges to $\alpha|_{A_\delta}$ with respect to the weak L^2-topology in $L^{n,q}_{(2)}(A_\delta, F)_{h_{\varepsilon_0},\widetilde{\omega}}$. Here $u_\varepsilon|_{A_\delta}$ (resp. $\alpha|_{A_\delta}$) denotes the restriction of u_ε (resp. α) to A_δ. Indeed for every $\gamma \in L^{n,q}_{(2)}(A_\delta, F)_{h_{\varepsilon_0},\widetilde{\omega}}$, the inner product $\langle\!\langle u_\varepsilon|_{A_\delta}, \gamma\rangle\!\rangle_{A_\delta} = \langle\!\langle u_\varepsilon, \widetilde{\gamma}\rangle\!\rangle_Y$ converges to $\langle\!\langle \alpha, \widetilde{\gamma}\rangle\!\rangle_Y = \langle\!\langle \alpha|_{A_\delta}, \gamma\rangle\!\rangle_{A_\delta}$, where $\widetilde{\gamma}$ denotes the zero extension of γ to Y. Since $u_\varepsilon|_{A_\delta}$ converges to $\alpha|_{A_\delta}$, we obtain

$$\|\alpha|_{A_\delta}\|_{h_{\varepsilon_0},\widetilde{\omega},A_\delta} \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|u_\varepsilon|_{A_\delta}\|_{h_{\varepsilon_0},\widetilde{\omega},A_\delta} = 0.$$

(Recall the norm of the weak limit can be estimated by the limit inferior of the norms of sequences.) Therefore we have $\alpha|_{A_\delta} = 0$ for any $\delta > 0$. By the definition of A_δ, the union of $\{A_\delta\}_{\delta>0}$ is equal to $Y = X \setminus Z$, which asserts that the weak limit α is zero on Y. □

By using Proposition 3.7, we complete the proof of Theorem 3.1. By the definition of u_ε, we have

$$u = u_\varepsilon + \overline{\partial} v_\varepsilon.$$

Proposition 3.7 says that $\overline{\partial} v_\varepsilon$ converges to u with respect to the weak L^2-topology. Then it is easy to see that u is a $\overline{\partial}$-exact form (that is, $u \in \operatorname{Im}\overline{\partial}$). This is because the subspace $\operatorname{Im}\overline{\partial}$ is closed in $L^{n,q}_{(2)}(Y, F)_{h_{\varepsilon_0},\widetilde{\omega}}$ with respect to the weak L^2-topology. Indeed, for every $\gamma = \gamma_1 + D''^*_{h_{\varepsilon_0}}\gamma_2 \in \mathcal{H}^{n,q}(F)_{h_{\varepsilon_0},\widetilde{\omega}} \oplus \operatorname{Im} D''^*_{h_{\varepsilon_0}}$, we have $\langle\!\langle u, \gamma\rangle\!\rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\langle\!\langle \overline{\partial} v_\varepsilon, \gamma_1 + D''^*_{h_{\varepsilon_0}}\gamma_2\rangle\!\rangle = 0$. Therefore we can conclude $u \in \operatorname{Im}\overline{\partial}$.

In summary, we proved that u is a $\overline{\partial}$-exact form in $L^{n,q}_{(2)}(Y, F)_{h_{\varepsilon_0},\widetilde{\omega}}$, which says that the cohomology class $\{u\}$ of u is zero in $H^q(X, K_X \otimes F \otimes \mathcal{I}(h_{\varepsilon_0}))$. By property (c), we obtain the conclusion of Theorem 3.1.

□

4. Proof of Corollaries related to the Extension conjecture

The purpose of this section is to obtain some extension theorems as applications of our injectivity theorem. For this purpose, by making use of the injectivity theorem (Theorem 3.1), we first prove the following extension theorem, which can be seen as a special case of the extension conjecture for dlt pairs.

Theorem 4.1. *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold and $\Delta = S + B$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor with the following assumptions:*

(1) *Δ is a simple normal crossing divisor with $0 \leq \Delta \leq 1$ and $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = S$.*
(2) *$K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly equivalent to an effective divisor D with $S \subset \operatorname{Supp} D$.*
(3) *$K_X + \Delta$ admits a (singular) metric h with semi-positive curvature.*

Then for an integer $m \geq 2$ with Cartier divisor $m(K_X+S+B)$ and any section $u \in H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X+S+B)))$ that belongs to the image of $H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X+S+B)) \otimes \mathcal{I}(h^{m-1}h_B)) \to H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X+S+B)))$, the section u can be extended to a section in $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X+S+B)))$.

Moreover if we assume that $h \leq Ch_D$ for some $C > 0$, where h_D is the singular metric induced by D, then any cohomology class $u \in H^q(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + \Delta)) \otimes \mathcal{I}(h^{m-1}h_B))$ can be extended to a class in $H^q(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + \Delta)) \otimes \mathcal{I}(h^{m-1}h_B))$ for any $q \geq 0$.

Remark 4.2. (1) *If X is projective and S is smooth (namely (X, Δ) is plt) and further if the divisor induced by a give $u \in H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + S + B)))$ is larger than the extension obstruction divisor (which is zero if $K_X + \Delta$ is nef), then $K_X + \Delta$ admits a (singular) metric h with $\sup_S |u|_h < \infty$. (see* [DHP, Corollary 1.8]*).*

(2) *Even if S has singularities, we can construct a (singular) metric h with $\sup_S |u|_h < \infty$ in the special case where u is zero along the singular locus of S, by the same method as in* [DHP].

Proof. We may add the additional assumption of $h \leq h_D$, where h_D is the singular metric on $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)$ defined by the effective divisor D. Indeed, for a smooth metric g on $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)$ and an L^1-function φ (resp. φ_D) with $h = g\,e^{-\varphi}$ (resp. $h_D = g\,e^{-\varphi_D}$), the metric defined by $g\,e^{-\max(\varphi, \varphi_D)}$ satisfies assumption (3) again.

We prove only the first conclusion since the second conclusion follows from the same argument as the first conclusion. We put $G := m(K_X + \Delta)$, and consider the following exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_X(G - S) \otimes I(h^{m-1}h_B) \to \mathcal{O}_X(G) \otimes \mathcal{I}(h^{m-1}h_B) \to \mathcal{O}_S(G) \otimes \mathcal{I}(h^{m-1}h_B) \to 0.$$

We prove the induced homomorphism

$$H^q(X, \mathcal{O}_X(G - S) \otimes I(h^{m-1}h_B)) \to H^q(X, \mathcal{O}_X(G) \otimes I(h^{m-1}h_B))$$

is injective by the injectivity theorem. Then the conclusion follows from the induced long exact sequence.

By the assumption on the support of D, we can take an integer $a > 0$ such that aD is a Cartier divisor and $S \leq aD$. Then we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & H^q(X, \mathcal{O}_X(G) \otimes I(h^{m-1}h_B)) \supseteq \mathrm{Im}\,(+S) \\ & \overset{+S}{\nearrow} & \Big\downarrow {\scriptstyle +(aD-S)} \\ H^q(X, \mathcal{O}_X(G - S) \otimes I(h^{m-1}h_B)) & \xrightarrow[+aD]{} & H^q(X, \mathcal{O}_X(G - S + aD) \otimes I(h^{a+m-1}h_B)), \end{array}$$

where the map $+S : H^q(X, \mathcal{O}_X(G - S) \otimes I(h^{m-1}h_B)) \to H^q(X, \mathcal{O}_X(G) \otimes I(h^{m-1}h_B))$. Our goal is to show that the map to the upper right is injective. For this goal, we show that the horizontal map is injective as an application of Theorem 3.1.

By the definition of G, we have

$$G - S = m(K_X + \Delta) - S = K_X + (m - 1)(K_X + \Delta) + B.$$

Then the line bundle $F := \mathcal{O}_X((m-1)(K_X+\Delta)+B)$ equipped with the metric $h_F := h^{m-1}h_B$ and the line bundle $L := \mathcal{O}_X(aD)$ equipped with the metric $h_L := h^a$ satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 3.1. Indeed, we have $h_F = h_L^{(m-1)/a}h_B$ by the construction, and further the point-wise norm $|s_{aD}|_{h_L}$ is bounded on X by the inequality $h \leq h_D$, where s_{aD} is the natural section of aD. Therefore the horizontal map is injective by Theorem 3.1. □

To obtain some results related to the abundance conjecture (Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.3), we need the following corollary, which is a slight generalization of Theorem 4.1.

Corollary 4.3. *Under the same situation as in Theorem 4.1, instead of assumption* (3)*, we assume the following assumption:*

(3′) *There exist effective* $\mathbb{Q}$*-divisors* E *and* F *and a* (*singular*) *metric* h *on* $\mathcal{O}_X(F)$ *with semi-positive curvature such that*
- $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} E + F$,
- $E + B$ *is simple normal crossing and* E *has no common component with* S,
- $\nu(h, x) = 0$ *at every point* $x \in S$.

Let $\widetilde{s}$ *be a section on* X *with* $\operatorname{div}\widetilde{s} = mE$*. Then for a section* $u \in H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(mF))$*, the section* $u \cdot \widetilde{s} \in H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + \Delta)))$ *can be extended to a section in* $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + \Delta)))$*.*

Proof. Let h_E be the singular metric on $\mathcal{O}_X(E)$ induced by the section $\widetilde{s} \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mE))$. By the definition, the metric h_E satisfies $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_{h_E} \geq 0$ and $\sup |\widetilde{s}|^m_{h_E} < \infty$. The product $h \cdot h_E$ determines the singular metric on $K_X + \Delta$ with semi-positive curvature. Therefore it is sufficient to show that $u \cdot \widetilde{s}$ belongs to $H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + \Delta)) \otimes \mathcal{J})$, where we put $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{I}(h^{m-1}h_E^{m-1}h_B)$ for simplicity.

In the first step, we see that

$$\mathcal{J}_x = \mathcal{I}(h_E^{m-1}h_B)_x$$

for every $x \in S$, where $\mathcal{F}_x$ denotes the stalk of a sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ at x. Let f be a holomorphic function on an open neighborhood U_x of $x \in S$ with $f \in \mathcal{I}(h_E^{m-1}h_B)_x$, and let φ (resp. φ_E, φ_B) be a local weight of h (resp. h_E, h_B). By taking a real number $p > 1$ with $\mathcal{I}(h_E^{p(m-1)}h_B^p) = \mathcal{I}(h_E^{m-1}h_B)$, we may assume that $|f|e^{-p(m-1)\varphi_E - p\varphi_B}$ is L^2-integrable on U_x. Then, by taking the positive number q with $1/p + 1/q = 1$, we obtain

$$\int_{U_x} |f|^2 e^{-2(m-1)\varphi - 2(m-1)\varphi_E - 2\varphi_B} \leq \Big(\int_{U_x} |f|^{2p} e^{-2p(m-1)\varphi_E - 2p\varphi_B} \Big)^{1/p} \cdot \Big(\int_{U_x} e^{-2q(m-1)\varphi} \Big)^{1/q}$$

by Hölder's inequality. The function $e^{-2q(m-1)\varphi}$ is locally L^2-integrable for any $q > 0$ by Skoda's lemma and the assumption of the Lelong number. On the other hand, as mentioned above, $|f|^p e^{-p(m-1)\varphi_E - p\varphi_B}$ is also locally L^2-integrable. Therefore we have $\mathcal{J}_x = \mathcal{I}(h_E^{m-1}h_B)_x$ for every $x \in S$.

In the second step, we prove

$$u \cdot \widetilde{s} \in H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + \Delta)) \otimes \mathcal{J}|_S),$$

where $\mathcal{J}|_S$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{J}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{J}|_S := \mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{J}/(\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{I}_S).$$

Let $\widetilde{u}$ be a local extension of u on an open neighborhood U_x of $x \in S$. By the klt condition of B, we can take a real number $p > 1$ with $\mathcal{I}(h_B^p) = \mathcal{O}_X$. Then for the holomorphic

function $g := \widetilde{u} \cdot \widetilde{s}$, by taking the positive number q with $1/p + 1/q = 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{U_x} |g|^2 e^{-2(m-1)\varphi_E - 2\varphi_B} &\leq \Big(\int_{U_x} |g|^{2p} e^{-2p(m-1)\varphi_E - 2p\varphi_B} \Big)^{1/p} \cdot \Big(\int_{U_x} 1 \Big)^{1/q} \\ &\leq \sup_{U_x} |g|^{2p} e^{-2p(m-1)\varphi_E} \Big(\int_{U_x} e^{-2p\varphi_B} \Big)^{1/p} \cdot \Big(\int_{U_x} 1 \Big)^{1/q}\end{aligned}$$

by Hölder's inequality again. The point-wise norm $|g|^{2p} e^{-2p(m-1)\varphi_E}$ is bounded by the choice of h_E, and $e^{-2q(m-1)\varphi}$ is locally L^2-integrable for any $q > 0$ by the assumption on the Lelong number. It implies that $u \cdot \widetilde{s}$ (locally) belongs to $\mathcal{I}(h_E^{m-1} h_B)|_S = \mathcal{J}|_S$.

Finally we show

$$u \cdot \widetilde{s} \in H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + \Delta)) \otimes \mathcal{J}).$$

By simple computations we have $\mathcal{O}_S \otimes \mathcal{J} = \mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{J}/(\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{I}_S)$, and thus, by the second step, it is sufficient to see

$$\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{I}_S = \mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{I}_S.$$

Here $\mathcal{I}_S$ denotes the ideal sheaf defined by S. By the first step and the assumption on the support of $E + B$. we have

$$\mathcal{J}_x = \mathcal{I}(h_E^{m-1} h_B)_x = \mathcal{O}_X(-\lfloor (m-1)E + B \rfloor)$$

for every $x \in S$. Since the divisors S and $E + B$ has no common component by the assumption on E, we can easily see $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{I}_S = \mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{I}_S$. Therefore $u \cdot \widetilde{s}$ actually belongs to $H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + \Delta)) \otimes \mathcal{J})$. The conclusion follows from Theorem 4.1. □

Remark 4.4. *When we apply the injectivity theorem in order to extend sections, we need to handle $\mathcal{O}_S \otimes \mathcal{I}(\varphi)$ (not $\mathcal{I}(\varphi)|_S$). When we apply the Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem, we usually use the restriction of multiplier ideal sheaves $\mathcal{I}(\varphi)|_S$. It is relatively difficult to handle $\mathcal{O}_S \otimes \mathcal{I}(\varphi)$. However the support condition of E (the second assumption of the above corollary) fortunately appears in the proof of the applications related to the abundance conjecture, which asserts $\mathcal{O}_S \otimes \mathcal{I}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}(\varphi)|_S$.*

In a special case of the above corollary when $E = \mathcal{O}_X$ and $\widetilde{s} = 1 \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, we obtain the following:

Corollary 4.5. *Under the same situation as in Theorem 4.1, instead of assumption* (3)*, we assume the following assumption:*

(3′′) *$K_X + \Delta$ admits a (singular) metric h such that $\sqrt{-1}\Theta_h \geq 0$ and $\nu(h, x) = 0$ at every point $x \in S$.*

Then for an integer $m \geq 2$ with Cartier divisor $m(K_X + \Delta)$, a section $u \in H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + \Delta)))$ can be extended to a section in $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + \Delta)))$.

For further applications of the above theorems, we prepare the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *Let φ be a (quasi)-psh function on a complex manifold X. If the Lelong number $\nu(\varphi, x_0)$ is zero at $x_0 \in X$, then for any modification $\pi : Y \to X$, the Lelong number $\nu(\pi^*\varphi, y)$ is zero at every point $y \in \pi^{-1}(x_0)$.*

Proof. For a contradiction, we assume that $\nu(\pi^*\varphi, y_0) > 0$ for some point $y_0 \in \pi^{-1}(x_0)$. By Skoda's lemma (see Theorem 2.5), we can take a sufficiently large number $m > 0$ such that $\pi^* dV_X e^{-2m\pi^*\varphi}$ is not integrable on a neighborhood of y_0, where dV_X is a standard volume form on a neighborhood U of x_0. By the change of variable formula, we have

$$\int_U e^{-2m\varphi} dV_X = \int_{\pi^{-1}(U)} e^{-2m\pi^*\varphi} \pi^* dV_X.$$

By the assumption of $\nu(\varphi, x_0) = 0$, the left hand side if finite for a sufficiently small U. It is a contradiction to the choice of m. Therefore $\nu(\pi^*\varphi, y) = 0$ at every point $y \in \pi^{-1}(x_0)$. □

5. Proof of Corollaries related to the abundance conjecture

In this section, we prove some applications related to the abundance conjecture. The proof of the following theorem is based on [DHP, Section 8] and [FG, Theorem 5.9]. We use the different MMP from them to preserve metric conditions.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that Conjecture 1.1 holds in dimension $n-1$. Let X be an n-dimensional normal projective variety and Δ be an $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor with the following assumptions:*

- *(X, Δ) is a klt pair such that there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D such that $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D$.*
- *There exists a projective birational morphism $\varphi : Y \to X$ such that Y is smooth and $\varphi^*(\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + \Delta)))$ admits a (singular) metric whose curvature is semi-positive and Lelong number is identically zero on $\operatorname{Supp} \varphi^* D$. Here m is a positive integer such that $m(K_X + \Delta)$ is Cartier.*

Then $K_X + \Delta$ is semi-ample.

Proof. Note that Conjecture 1.1 in dimension $n-1$ implies that the existence of good minimal model for $(n-1)$-dimensional klt pairs by [GL, Theorem 4.3] or [DHP, Remark 2.6]. First we may assume that $\kappa(K_X + \Delta) = 0$ by Kawamata's theorem [Ka, Theorem 7.3] (see also [KeMMc, 5.6 Lemma]). There exists the effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D such that

$$D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_X + \Delta$$

by the assumption. For a contradiction, assume $D \neq 0$. We may assume that φ is a log resolution of $(X, \Delta + D)$. We write

$$K_Y + B = \varphi^*(K_X + \Delta) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \varphi^* D.$$

Let $l = \operatorname{lct}(\varphi^* \mathrm{D}; \mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{B})$. Set effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors C, S, and G such that $C + S = (B + l\varphi^* D)^{\geq 0}$, $\lfloor C + S \rfloor = S$, and $G = (B + l\varphi^* D)^{\leq 0}$. Then there are no common components of any two divisors of C, S, and G, and we have

$$K_Y + C + S \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (1 + l)\varphi^* D + G,$$

$$S + C - G = B + l\varphi^* D.$$

Note that $S \neq 0$ and G is φ-exceptional. Then we see that $S \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} \varphi^* D$. Let us consider the MMP for $(Y, C + S)$ over X by [BCHM] and [F3, Theorem 2.3]. Then this program

contracts only the divisor G. Let $f : Y \dashrightarrow Y'$ be a minimal model of this program and $\varphi' : Y' \to X$ the induced morphism. Then S is not contracted by f since S and G have no common component. Denote C' and $S'(\neq 0)$ by the strict transforms on Y of C and S. Then it follows that

$$K_{Y'} + C' + S' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (1+l)\varphi'^{*}D.$$

Thus $K_{Y'} + C' + S'$ is nef.

Claim 5.2. *For a sufficiently large and divisible $m' \in \mathbb{Z}$, the restriction map*

$$H^0(Y', m'(K_{Y'} + C' + S')) \to H^0(S', m'(K_{Y'} + C' + S'))$$

is surjective

Proof of Claim 5.2. Let u be a non-zero section in $H^0(S', m'(K_{Y'} + C' + S'))$ and let



be common log resolutions such that β is isomorphic over the generic point of every lc center of $(Y,' C' + S')$. Then we write

$$K_W + S_W + F \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (1+l)\beta^{*}\varphi'^{*}D + E,$$

where S_W is the strict transform of S', and E and F are effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor such that $\lfloor F \rfloor = 0$ and any two divisors of S_W, F and E have no common component. Note that $m'F$ and $m'E$ are Cartier since m' is sufficiently large and divisible. Let $u_{m'E}$ and $h_{m'E}$ be the global section and the metric associated to $m'E$ respectively. Then by the assumption we have a semi-positive singular metric h on $m'(1+l)\beta^{*}\varphi'^{*}D$ induced by the pullback (we use the same symbol since it contains no confusion).

By applying Corollary 4.3 for $F = (1+l)\beta^{*}\varphi'^{*}D$ (cf. Lemma 4.6) and $\widetilde{s} = u_{m'E}$, we have a section $U \in H^0(m'(K_W + S_W + F))$ such that $U_{|S_W} = \beta^{*}u \otimes (u_{m'E})|_{S_W}$. Thus we see that

$$H^0(Y', m'(K_{Y'} + C' + S')) \to H^0(S', m'(K_{Y'} + C' + S'))$$

is surjective. Indeed we see that

$$H^0(W, m'(K_W + S_W + F)) \to H^0(Y', m'(K_{Y'} + C' + S'))$$

is isomorphic by mapping $s \mapsto \beta^{*}s \otimes u_{m'E}$ for a section $s \in H^0(W, m'(K_W + S_W + F))$, and

$$H^0(S', m'(K_{Y'} + C' + S')) \to H^0(S_W, m'(K_{S_W} + F|_{S_W}))$$

is injection by mapping $t \mapsto \beta^{*}t \otimes (u_{m'E})|_{S_W}$ for a section $t \in H^0(S', m'(K_{Y'} + C' + S'))$ by $\beta_{*}\mathcal{O}_{S_W} = \mathcal{O}_{S'}$ from Kollár–Shokurov's connectedness Theorem [Ko2, 17.4 Theorem]. We finish the proof of Claim 5.2.

□

On the other hand, this restriction map is zero map since

$$\kappa(K_X + \Delta) = \kappa(K_{Y'} + C' + S') = 0$$

and $S' \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} \varphi'^* D$. The pair $(S', C'_{S'})$ is a projective semi-log canonical pair such that $K_{S'} + C'_{S'}$ is nef, where $(K_{Y'} + C' + S')|_{S'} = (K_{S'} + C'_{S'})$. This implies $K_{S'} + C'_{S'}$ is semi-ample, because of the abundance conjecture (Conjecture 1.1) holds in dimension $n-1$ and [FG, Theorem 1.5] or [HX] (here we need the assumption of projectivity). This is a contradiction to Claim 5.2. Thus $D = 0$. We finish the proof. □

By combining the abundance theorem in dimension 3 ([Ka2, Theorem 1.1], [KeMMc, 1.1 Theorem], [F1, Theorem 0.1]), we obtain the following results:

Corollary 5.3. *Let (X, Δ) be a 4-dimensional projective klt pair. Assume that there exists a projective birational morphism $\varphi : Y \to X$ on to each components such that Y is smooth and $\varphi^*(\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X+\Delta)))$ admits a singular metric whose curvature is semi-positive and Lelong number is identically zero (in particular it is satisfied if h is smooth). Here m is an integer with Cartier divisor $m(K_X + \Delta)$. If $\kappa(K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$, then $K_X + \Delta$ is semi-ample.*

Remark 5.4. *When h is smooth, we can show Corollary 5.3 without using our injectivity theorem. By replacing Theorem 1.3 to the generalized Enoki's injectivity theorem after Fujino* [F5, Theorem 1.2 and Corollary1.3] *in the proof of Theorems 4.1, 5.1, and Corollary 4.3, we can obtain it.*

Finally we give a result for semi-ampleness by combining with Verbitsky's non-vanishing theorem ([V, Theorem 4.1]).

Corollary 5.5. *Let X be a 4-dimensional projective hyperKähler manifold and L be a line bundle admitting a (singular) metric whose curvature is semi-positive and Lelong number is identically zero (in particular it is satisfied if h is smooth). Then L is semi-ample.*

Proof. It is enough to show $\kappa(L) \geq 0$ by Corollary 5.3 since if there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor such that $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} L$, the pair $(X, \varepsilon D)$ is klt and $K_X + \varepsilon D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \varepsilon L$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. If $q(L, L) > 0$, then L is big, where $q(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Bogomolov–Beauville–Fujiki form. In the case of $q(L, L) = L^{\dim X} = 0$, then $\kappa(L) \geq 0$ follows from [V, Theorem 4.1].

□

References

[A1] F. Ambro, *Quasi-log varieties*, Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova **240** (2003), Biratsion. Geom. Linein. Sist. Konechno Porozhdennye Algebry, 220–239; translation in Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 2003, no. 1 (240), 214–233

[A2] F. Ambro, *An injectivity theorem*, to appear in Compos. Math.

[AC] E. Amerik and F. Campana, *Characteristic foliation on non-uniruled smooth divisors on projective hyperkaehler manifolds*, Preprint, arXiv:1405.0539.

[BCHM] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. D. Hacon, and J. M$^{\mathrm{c}}$Kernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), 405–468.

[COP] F. Campana, K. Oguiso, and T. Peternell, *Non-algebraic Hyperkaehler manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **85**, Number 3 (2010), 397–424.

[Dem] J.-P. Demailly, *Analytic methods in algebraic geometry*, Lecture Notes on the web page of the author.

[Dem-book] J.-P. Demailly, *Complex analytic and differential geometry*, Lecture Notes on the web page of the author.

[DHP] J.-P. Demailly, C. D. Hacon, and M. Păun, *Extension theorems, non-vanishing and the existence of good minimal models*, Acta Math. **210** (2013) 203–259.

[DPS] J.-P. Demailly, T. Peternell, and M. Schneider, *Pseudo-effective line bundles on compact Kähler manifolds*, International Journal of Math. **6** (2001), 689–741.

[E] I. Enoki. *Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem for compact Kähler manifolds*, Einstein metrics and Yang-Mills connections (Sanda, 1990), 59–68.

[EV-book] H. Esnault and E. Viehweg, *Lectures on vanishing theorems*, DMV Seminar, **20**, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, (1992).

[F1] O. Fujino, *Abundance theorem for semi log canonical threefolds*, Duke Math. J. **102** (2000), no. 3, 513–532.

[F2] O. Fujino, *Introduction to the log minimal model program for log canonical pairs*, preprint (2008).

[F3] O. Fujino, *Semi-stable minimal model program for varieties with trivial canonical divisor*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **87** (2011), no. 3, 25–30.

[F4] O. Fujino, *Fundamental theorems for the log minimal model program*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **47** (2011), no. 3, 727–789.

[F5] O. Fujino, *A transcendental approach to Kollár's injectivity theorem*, Osaka J. Math. **49** (2012), no. 3, 833–852.

[F-book] O. Fujino, *Foundation of the minimal model program*, preprint (2014).

[FG] O. Fujino and Y. Gongyo, *Log pluricanonical representations and the abundance conjecture*, Compositio Math. **150** (2014), 593–620

[GL] Y. Gongyo and B. Lehmann, *Reduction maps and minimal model theory*, Compositio Math. **149**, No.2, 295–308.

[HX] C. Hacon and C. Xu, *On Finiteness of B-representations and Semi-log Canonical Abundance*, Preprint, arXiv:1107.4149.

[Ka] Y. Kawamata, *Pluricanonical systems on minimal algebraic varieties*, Invent. Math. **79** (1985), no. 3, 567–588.

[Ka2] Y. Kawamata, *Abundance theorem for minimal threefolds*, Invent. Math. **108** (1992), no. 2, 229–246.

[KaMM] Y. Kawamata, K. Matsuda, and K. Matsuki, *Introduction to the minimal model problem*, Algebraic geometry, Sendai, 1985, 283–360, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 10, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.

[KeMMc] S. Keel, K. Matsuki, and J. M^{c}Kernan, *Log abundance theorem for threefolds*, Duke Math. J. **75** (1994), no. 1, 99–119, Corrections to: "*Log abundance theorem for threefolds*", Duke Math. J. **122** (2004), no. 3, 625–630.

[Ko1] J. Kollár, *Higher direct images of dualizing sheaves. I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **123** (1986), no. 1, 11–42.

[Ko2] J. Kollár, Adjunction and discrepancies, *Flips and Abundance for algebraic threefolds*, Astérisque **211** (1992), 183–192.

[KoM] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Math.,134 (1998).

[Mat1] S. Matsumura, *A Nadel vanishing theorem via injectivity theorems*, to appear in Math. Ann.

[Mat2] S. Matsumura, *An injectivity theorem with multiplier ideal sheaves of singular metrics with transcendental singularities*, Preprint, arXiv:1308.2033v2.

[N] N. Nakayama, *Zariski decomposition and abundance*, MSJ Memoirs, **14**. Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 2004.

[O] T. Ohsawa, *On a curvature condition that implies a cohomology injectivity theorem of Kollár–Skoda type*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **41** (2005), no. 3, 565–577.

[T] S. G. Tankeev, *On n-dimensional canonically polarized varieties and varieties of fundamental type*, Math. USSR-Izv. vol. **5** (1971), no. 1, 29–43.

[V] M. Verbitsky, *HyperKähler SYZ conjecture and semipositive line bundles*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **19** (2010), no. 5, 1481–1493.

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, the University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan.
E-mail address: gongyo@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, 180 Queen's Gate, London SW7 2AZ, UK.
E-mail address: y.gongyo@imperial.ac.uk

Kagoshima University, 1-21-35 Korimoto, Kagoshima 890-0065, Japan.
E-mail address: shinichi@sci.kagoshima-u.ac.jp, mshinichi0@gmail.com